

REMARKS

Claims 5-39 are pending, with claims 5, 10, 13, 18, 23, 29 and 34 being independent. Claims 1-4 have been cancelled and claims 5, 8-10, 12, 13, 15, 17, 18, 20, 22, 23, 25, 26, 28, 29, 31, 33, 34, 36, 37 and 39 have been amended. No new matter has been added.

In response to the objection to the drawings, applicants note that item 2007 of Figure 1 is described at page 6, line 1 of the application. In view of this, applicants request withdrawal of the objection.

In response to the rejection under section 112, second paragraph, the claims have been amended to define EL, CPU, TFT, CCD, A/D and D/A, and claims 13, 18, 23, 29 and 34 have been amended to address the Examiner's concerns.. Applicants request withdrawal of the rejection under section 112 in view of these amendments.

The rejection of claims 1, 3 and 4 as being anticipated by Toffolo is moot in view of the cancellation of claims 1-4.

Claim 5 and claims 6-9, which depend from claim 5, have been rejected as being anticipated by Kim. Applicants request withdrawal of this rejection because Kim does not describe or suggest connecting a voltage changer to the EL element of each pixel via a switch, as recited in amended claim 5. Kim merely shows connecting the driver 4 (which the action equates to the voltage changer) to the panel 5 (which the action equates to the light emitting device).

Claims 10, 12, 13-15, 17-20, 22-26, 28-31 and 33-38 have been rejected as being obvious over Kim in view Stewart. Like claim 5, independent claims 10, 13, 18, 23, 29 and 34 all recite connecting a voltage changer to the EL element of each pixel via a switch. Applicants request withdrawal of this rejection because, as noted above with respect to claim 5, Kim does not describe or suggest connecting a voltage changer in this manner, and because Stewart does not remedy this failure of Kim.